DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 633 TM 002 638

AUTHOR	Gilbert, Katherine J.
TITLE	Year One of a Three-Year Evaluation Study of University Hill Secondary School.
INSTITUTION	Vancouver Board of School Trustees (British Columbia). Dept. of Planning and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	RR-72-17
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Community Involvement; Educational Change; *Experimental Programs; *Independent Study; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; School Attitudes; Secondary Grades; *Self Directed Groups; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

The first year of a new program, in which students were expected to take responsibility for their own education, is evaluated in this report. Study was almost entirely independent; students usually worked at their own rate and used the teacher as a resource person. Parental and community involvement was emphasized. Volunteers worked at the school, and classes used facilities at the University of British Columbia. Results from an internal evaluation by the staff, questionnaires, and interviews of students and parents indicated support for the program. Results of the semantic differential administered in September 1971 and June 1972 showed that students had more positive feelings toward school discipline, teachers, teaching, school, learning, attendance, books, themselves, marks and reports in June. All changes were statistically significant, as was the increase in negative feelings about school last year. Results of the standardized testing completed in June 1972 indicated that students had attained average or above achievement in English, mathematics, and reading skills. (For related documents, see TM 002 639-40.) (Author/KM)

FORM 9510 PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 076633

TM 002 638

RESEARCH REPORT

Year One of a Three-Year Evaluation Study of University Hill Secondary School

July, 1972

Katherine J. Gilbert

Research Report 72-17

Department of Planning and Evaluation
Board of School Trustees
1595 West 10th Avenue
Vancouver 9, B. C.

ED 076633

YEAR ONE OF A THREE-YEAR EVALUATION STUDY OF UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

July, 1972

Katherine J. Gilbert

Research Report 72-17

Department of Planning and Evaluation
Board of School Trustees
1595 West 10th Avenue
Vancouver 9, B. C.

YEAR ONE OF A THREE-YEAR EVALUATION STUDY OF UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Introduction	1
Description	1
Results of the Internal Evaluation	3
Summary of Questionnaire Returns	5
Semantic Differential and Standardized Testing Results	11
Conclusions	14
Appendix A - Summary of Contracted Student Time Questionnaire Returns from Students at University Hill Secondary School	15
Appendix B - Summary of Questionnaire Returns from Parents of Students at University Hill Secondary School	22
Appendix C - Semantic Differential Form Used at University Hill Secondary School in September 1971 and June 1972	29

YEAR ONE OF A THREE-YEAR EVALUATION STUDY OF UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

Abstract

The purpose of this report is to summarize information on various aspects of the program at University Hill Secondary School. An entirely new program was introduced during the 1971-72 school year in which students were expected to take responsibility for their own education.

Under the new program students were given the choice of many different activities in which to participate and topics to study. Their study was almost entirely independent; they usually worked at their own rate and used the teacher as a resource person. Each student had a unique schedule that contained considerable time to use as he thought best.

Emphasis was placed on parental and community involvement with the school. Many volunteers worked at the school in a variety of tasks. Classes also made considerable use of facilities at U. B. C.

The reaction to the new program by staff, students, and parents was favourable. Results from an internal evaluation by the staff, questionnaires, and interviews of students and parents all indicated support for the program even though problems or weaknesses were recognized.

Results of the semantic differential that was administered in September 1971 and June 1972 showed that students had more positive feelings towards "School Discipline", "Teachers", "Teaching", "School", "Learning", "Attendance", "Books", "Me", "Marks", and "Reports" in June than in September and that the change in each case was statistically significant. Students had more negative feelings about "School Last Year" in June and that change was also significant.

The results of the standardized testing program that was completed in June 1972 indicated that the students at University Hill Secondary had attained average or above achievement in English, Mathematics and Reading skills. Mathematics had the best results and English the poorest, although still average when compared to a college-preparatory norming group.

YEAR ONE OF A THREE-YEAR EVALUATION STUDY OF UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

Introduction

During the 1971-72 school year, a new program was introduced at University Hill Secondary School. It was a program based on the philosophy of education as a continuing life process with school as one facet of the process. The program that evolved from this philosophy was quite unique.

Throughout the year, information on various aspects of the program was gathered from a variety of sources and relayed to the staff of University Hill Secondary so that they could use it in making decisions about program changes. The purpose of this report is to summarize all of the information that was gathered and to describe generally how the program worked during its first year.

Description

The program at University Hill Secondary School underwent many changes during the course of the year; changes that were brought about by staff decisions that they were necessary. This description of the school offers an idea of how the program functioned.

The school's objectives, as stated by the staff were:

1. To encourage student responsibility, and self-direction for learning, by exposing the students to a variety of learning processes.
2. To provide opportunities for the student to experience a variety of learning situations.
3. To encourage a social awareness and a sensitivity to other's needs as well as his own.
4. To broaden the concept of school so as to include the resources of the community.
5. To measure the effectiveness of the program.

University Hill Secondary School had an enrolment of 330 for the 1971-72 school year, the smallest of all of the Vancouver secondary schools, with most students following an academic program. There were fourteen staff members (the principal and thirteen teachers) and six staff assistants. The teachers and principal acted as the decision-making body, with all members having equal importance. They functioned in a democratic manner and made all decisions jointly.

Students were assigned to a teacher who was to act as his adviser during the year. (Each teacher had approximately 25 students from all grades in his advisory group.) The advisory groups met weekly to complete school business and additional individual meetings were held as required. One of the purposes of this counselling arrangement was to provide each student (and his parents) with someone to whom he could talk and discuss his problems.

Students were given a schedule of classes at the beginning of each term from which they were to organize their time. For each class in which they enrolled they were to attend a given amount of regular class time and they were to "contract" for additional time to complete the work for the class. The amount of class time designated for each course was considerably less than in other secondary schools. The amount of contractual time to be spent was decided upon by the student, his teacher, and his adviser , and varied as the student progressed in his work. Therefore, each student had a unique schedule and it changed frequently in some cases. Students were expected to attend classes regularly, but in most cases, formal attendance reporting was not done. Students used their time not spent in class as they wanted.

In all of the classes, the emphasis was on individual progress of students. Consequently, there were few classes in which the lecture format was used. Usually, students spent class time working on their own and if necessary, getting help from the teacher or a helper. As a result, regular class time was spent in much the same way as contractual time for many classes.

The major difference in the curriculum of University Hill was the Humanities course. It replaced English, Social Studies, and Fine Arts classes for all students and offered instead a consolidated approach to the three using the theme: Communication. All students were required to take Humanities and were grouped into three grade levels: Grade 8 in one, Grade 9 in one, and Grades 10, 11, and 12 in one. The course made use of large group presentations, small group (about 20 people) sessions, individual conferences, seminars, mini-courses, and elective courses to accomplish its goals. Teachers used team teaching, volunteer instructors (sometimes other students), and many other teaching techniques during the year. The content of the seminars, which were to meet for 40 minutes per week, was to have been determined by the group. The mini-courses were six to nine week courses covering a variety of topics. Students were required to take three mini-courses per year, one of which was Writing. Examples of the topics dealt with in the mini-courses were Architecture, Ceramics, Creative Writing, Film Lecture Series, Mythology, Organic Gardening and Religions.

There was considerable change in the Humanities course during the school year. In December 1971, it underwent a major revision which, according to several parents and students, improved it a great deal. The changes that were made tended to impose more structure and a clearer description of what was expected of students in Humanities. In planning for next year, even further revisions have been made in this direction.

Partly due to the location of the school and partly due to the program, a great effort was made to utilize community resources. Over fifty volunteers were involved with the school, many of them being students and/or faculty members from the University of British Columbia. University facilities were used in Physical Education, Mathematics, Science, Humanities, and Language classes. To enable students to participate in more activities, both in and out of school, the school day was lengthened (school was open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) and students had 80 minutes for lunch.

Emphasis was placed on parental involvement with the school. Early in the planning of the program at University Hill Secondary School, it was decided that a committee of parents, teachers, and students should be formed to serve as a policy board. Called the Advisory Council at first, the committee was formed of elected parents, representative students and teachers. The Council chose, however, to redefine its role and changed the name to the Consultative Committee. The Committee saw itself as one which should not have any authority in decision-making but rather should consist of parent and student representatives whom the teaching staff should consult. Difficulties arose throughout the year, stemming from poor communication between the teachers and the parents. By the end of the year, however, the communications problem had improved through much effort on the part of the staff and parents and aided by a newsletter to parents from the Committee.

Results of the Internal Evaluation

The information contained in this section was obtained from the Department of Education Accreditation Booklet prepared by a committee of teachers at University Hill Secondary School. This information is given only to indicate the types of things the teachers felt were important.

The committee felt that the most commendable aspects of the school staff and administration were:

1. Relations were close--there exists a close inter-relationship between staff and administration and between the domains.
2. Lateralization of responsibility for administrative functions and for the total program.
3. Acceptance of individual professional responsibility for decisions made.
4. High level of qualification.
5. Time spent on the job, both in and out of school hours.
6. Sacrifice of pay--no department heads, no vice-principal.

The aspects which were considered to be most in need of improvement were:

1. Greater definition of roles.
2. Greater inter-disciplinary integration.
3. More adequate inter-staff communication.

The recommendations offered, in order of priority, to overcome these weaknesses were:

1. More planning time.
2. More time for preparation of materials.
3. More direct implementation of plans.
4. More involvement of staff assistants in direct planning and total resources.
5. Increased participation by staff assistants in decision-making by their inclusion in staff meetings.

The major strengths of the programming were given as:

1. Students participate in course programming.
2. There is a broad scope of courses offered.
3. Students are involved in a variety of creative activities.
4. There is growth of self-motivation in many students as demonstrated by their increased utilization of unscheduled time.
5. The flexibility of the program as well as the process of continued evaluation makes it possible to provide adjustments in the program as the need arises.

The main weaknesses were:

1. There is need for greater integration of disciplines.
2. There is need for greater capitalization of resources in people within the school.
3. Student use of unscheduled time--there is lack of involvement on the part of some students.

The recommendations offered to overcome the weaknesses in programming were, in order of priority:

1. Modification to timetable in the light of experience this year.
2. Modification in mechanics of attendance records, records of transfers between courses during the year.
3. Definite statements regarding requirements in some courses.
4. Adjustment of fixed class time, contractual time and unscheduled time for individual students.

As a part of the evaluation of each subject area, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations were given. For each subject area there were different items mentioned, but patterns were evident. Generally, the strengths of the individual subject areas were:

1. Continuous evaluation of pupil progress.
2. The positive attitudes held by students towards the school.
3. The wide variety of experiences offered students.
4. The individualized programs that were possible.

The weakness that was mentioned most was that time allotments for subjects were too small.

The recommendations made by teachers were:

1. Provide better equipment and facilities.
2. Provide more teacher time for planning and with students.
3. Clarify the aims and objectives of courses.

Summary of Questionnaire Returns

During the 1971-72 school year, three questionnaires were distributed: one to a sample of students which asked about their expectations of University Hill, one to all students which asked about contracted student time, and one to all parents concerning contracted student time.

The first questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 62 students (18.7% of the enrolment) in December 1971. They were asked (a) to list the expectations they held in September and whether or not those expectations had been fulfilled, and (b) to list which of their original expectations had since changed. The most frequent responses to these questions are summarized below.

TABLE I: RESPONSES TO ITEM I: "WHAT EXPECTATIONS DID YOU HOLD FOR THE PROGRAM PROPOSED FOR UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL AS YOU ENTERED THE SCHOOL IN SEPTEMBER, 1971" AND "HAVE THESE EXPECTATIONS BEEN FULFILLED?"

Expectations	Have these expectations been fulfilled?		
	Yes	No	Partially
Progress at one's own rate	18	5	9
Better, freer program	13	4	9
Wider course choice	12	1	2
Better teachers	9	2	5
More student responsibility	8	4	5
Improved courses	7	8	5

When students were asked to list which of their original expectations had changed from September to December, some used the opportunity to make general comments and criticisms of the program. The main areas about which they expressed concern or their opinions had changed were:

1. The Humanities course: Some students mentioned too much pressure and too many assignments as problems while others said the class was confusing and frustrating. A total of 14 students expressed concern. (It should be mentioned that the Humanities course was changed considerably in January 1972.)

2. The amount of work assigned: Six students had expected a lighter work load than they had had in traditional schools but had found that to be false.

3. The courses in general: Students commented that there was too much emphasis placed on assignments, that more guidelines were necessary and that there should have been more lectures. Five students made remarks of this nature.

4. Student responsibility: Five students said that they had expected their fellow students to exhibit more initiative, responsibility and energy.

5. Student sociability: Five students who had attended University Hill prior to September 1971 stated that they had expected a polarization of "old" and "new" students, but that none had developed.

The major trends drawn from the students' remarks were:

*The Humanities course was not what the students expected and it dissatisfied them more than any other course.

*The courses had generally improved, although the students felt that too much emphasis was placed on assignments.

*The students' expectations of increased individuality and responsibility were successfully fulfilled.

*The choice of courses was sufficiently broad to please most students.

*The students were satisfied that the teachers were better.

*Those students who had expected less work were in error.

*There were essentially no differences in the responses among grades or between the "old" and "new" students.

Questionnaires were received from only 82% of the student population, in spite of the effort that was made to reach all of the students, and from 58% of the parents. (Both questionnaires were designed to sample the opinions of persons involved with University Hill about the concept of contracted student time, the way it was implemented in 1971-72, and its consequences.) Complete tabulation of the questionnaire returns can be found in Appendices A and B.

The questionnaires to all students and to all parents concerning contracted student time were distributed in January 1972. For the purposes of this study, contracted student time was defined as below:

> "Students at University Hill Secondary School were assigned less class time per week than was normally the case in secondary school. To compensate, students were allotted contracted student time in each subject area. Contracted student time, therefore, was defined as the scheduling of student time in addition to allotted class time (called timetabled time) to enable the student to complete the requirements of a course."
>
> "The suggested purposes of this approach were:
> (1) To provide a student with the opportunity to take responsibility for his own progress.
> (2) To provide a slow worker extra time with teacher assistance.
> (3) To give a fast worker extra time for reading and research.
> (4) To enable a teacher to assign extra time to a student if and when required."

Nearly all of the students (94%) and parents (93%) who responded accepted the stated definition as a reasonable interpretation of the concept. Over half of the students (55%) and parents (50%) said that they felt that the purpose of contracted student time as outlined were being fulfilled. However, one-third of the respondents (35% of the students and 32% of the parents) felt that the purposes were not being fulfilled. The comment was made by students that many students did not use contracted time as it was intended; they just wasted their time.

A majority of students (79%) indicated that they preferred having minimal class time plus contracted time to the traditional timetable approach as used in most schools. A smaller majority of parents (56%) preferred this approach for their children while 26% favoured the traditional timetable approach. Students from Grades 8 and 12 were more in favour of the traditional timetable approach than were students in Grades 9, 10, and 11. The parents whose children attended University Hill Secondary School for the first time in 1971-72 strongly favoured the contracted student time approach.

The primary strengths of the contracted student time approach, as seen by the students, were:

1. Students could work independently and at their own pace.
2. Students were responsible for their own decisions.
3. Students could devote more time to favourite or difficult subjects.

The parents cited the same types of things as strengths:

1. More responsibility was placed on the students.
2. Each student could progress at his own rate.
3. Programs could be individualized.

Listed as weaknesses of the program by the students were:

1. Students took advantage of the extra freedom to "skip out" of school or do nothing. Over 39% of the students made a comment of this nature.
2. Students lacked the necessary initiative to plan their time, and it was easy to fall behind in subjects without realizing it.

The parents pointed to similar things as weaknesses:

1. Some students would just "play around" instead of seeking the help they needed.
2. Some students needed more structure and supervision.
3. Students could easily fall behind.

Nearly all of the students reported changes in the positive direction of their attitudes towards some aspect of school. Mention was made most often about the better relationship with teachers. The parents also noticed attitude changes in their children, particularly towards teachers.

The students were asked to compare the amount of contracted time recommended for them and the amount they actually spent to complete their work, but most of them could not. There appeared to be no clear understanding on the part of the students reporting as to how much time was recommended for them.

The students were evenly divided about whether or not they thought they would benefit from more teacher direction (44% thought that they would and 44% thought that they would not). The Grade 12 students indicated a definite preference for more teacher direction (61% in favour, and 29% opposed).

Approximately one-half of the students (50%) felt that they had worked harder in 1971-72 than in previous years and slightly fewer students (48%) said that they thought they would achieve more. Only 20% indicated that they thought they were working less or were achieving less than they had before.

Of the parents that responded, 50% felt that they had been well informed about the concept of contracted student time when school began, but 49% felt that they were not.

Most of the parents were quite satisfied with University Hill Secondary School and the contracted student time approach. Many offered suggestions for improving the program and only a very few completely opposed it. There was a substantial number, however, who expressed concern over various aspects of the program. These concerns included:

1. the seemingly lax attendance regulations,
2. the lack of guidance for students who had not functioned well under the program, and
3. the poor organization and scheduling of mini-courses, seminars and classes.

Information Obtained in Interviews

On several occasions, people involved with University Hill Secondary School were interviewed to obtain additional information. Students, parents, teachers, and a group of teachers who substituted for the regular staff for one week were interviewed. The purpose of these interviews was to augment the data already gathered and to obtain opinions from different points of view. The information sought in these interviews differed in accordance with the person who was being interviewed. Basically, the interviews dealt with the person's involvement with the school during the year, with his opinions about the relative merits and drawbacks of the program, and with its successes.

The parents who were contacted (eleven, in all) were chosen from four groups:

1. parents of students who planned to attend University Hill Secondary next year and who lived inside the district,
2. parents of students who planned to attend University Hill Secondary next year and who lived outside the district,
3. parents of students who planned to attend school some place other than University Hill and who lived inside the district, and
4. parents of students who planned to attend school some place other than University Hill and who lived outside the district.

The students that were interviewed were selected purely by chance, that is, students who walked by the school office on a regular school day were asked for an interview. Ten students were interviewed. All teachers that served as teacher substitutes during the Planning Week for the regular staff were contacted and interviewed.

The most important feature of these interviews was the number of positive remarks that were made. Even though some people were deeply upset or disappointed with aspects of the program, most were quite satisfied.

The parents of students who did not plan to attend University Hill next year gave two main reasons for their children leaving.

1. the program was not suitable for their children, or vice versa. They suggested the use of screening procedures for students as a solution to this problem.
2. when their son/daughter had difficulties or was not working as expected, the parents received no help or information from the staff. An improvement of communication channels definitely appears to be needed.

These parents seemed most eager to express their worries to someone and were very frank. Most of them indicated that they saw advantages in the program, even if they were limited to the very bright or mature students.

The parents whose children planned to attend University Hill Secondary next year had different opinions--some were extremely enthusiastic and others had reservations. The concerns of these parents were similar to those mentioned above. The enthusiastic parents each gave different reasons for liking the school and its program.

The parents were generally unaware of the actual purpose of the Consultative Committee. Some, in fact, did not even know of its existence.

The students, with one exception, were completely in favour of the contracted student time approach. They felt that the strengths of the program lie in the freedom given to students and the relaxed, friendly relationships that had developed with teachers. They could think of no real weaknesses and suggested no substantial changes in the program for next year. Most of them felt that they had learned at least as much as if they had been in a more traditional school.

The reaction of the substitute teachers was favourable, too. Each said that he had seen students who were not working, but thought that the majority were doing satisfactorily.

The regular teachers in the school generally seemed satisfied with the progress that has been made toward creating a program which emphasizes the individual student's responsibility and freedom. Many of the University Hill teachers were, however, concerned about those students who did not seem to have benefitted from the new program. These teachers were continuing to search for ways of accommodating these students without weakening the school's philosophy. Some of the teachers were concerned about adverse parental opinion, but this concern has lessened as parents have become increasingly supportive. The teachers seemed to look forward to a second year in which they will continue to work toward the fundamental goals of the new program.

Semantic Differential and Standardized Testing Results

To obtain more sources of information about the program at University Hill Secondary School and its effect on the students, standardized tests were administered to all students in June, 1972 and a semantic differential was given in September 1971 and June 1972.

Semantic Differential

A semantic differential is an instrument designed to measure attitude changes on the part of students. The concepts that were included on the form were "learning", "school last year", "books", "teaching", "school discipline", "attendance", "marks", "reports", "me", "adults", "school", and "teachers". An example of the form used both times can be found in Appendix C. A total of 305 students completed the semantic differential at the first sitting and of those, 193 students (63%) completed it the second time.

Scores on the pre- and post-tests were obtained for each concept and each student. Differences were calculated and paired-t tests performed to determine if the change in attitude was significant in the statistical sense. For every concept except "school last year" the attitudes were more positive in June than in September. For "school last year" the change was negative and statistically significant. The only concept for which the change was not significant was "adults". All of the others showed a significant, positive change. Table II summarizes the results.

TABLE II: STATISTICS CALCULATED FOR CONCEPTS ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ADMINISTERED AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL IN SEPTEMBER 1971 AND JUNE 1972

Concept	Calculated Statistic	Level of Significance
"School Discipline"	5.56	.001
"Teacher"	5.03	.001
"Teaching"	4.66	.001
"School"	4.13	.001
"Learning"	3.88	.001
"Attendance"	3.60	.001
"Books"	2.72	.01
"Me"	2.57	.02
"Marks"	2.17	.05
"Reports"	1.82	.10
"School Last Year"	-1.70	.10
"Adults"	1.30	difference is not significant

These results indicate a substantial advance in students' opinions of the concepts listed, except for "school last year" and "adults". Significant changes for so many different areas implies that the structure of University Hill encourages better attitudes towards school than the more traditional approach.

Standardized Test Results

The standardized testing program that was carried out encompassed the entire student population and emphasized English, Mathematics and Reading skills. Students in Grade 8 took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Form E1M) and the Beattie Test of Mathematical Fundamentals. Students in Grades 9-12 took subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test, High School Battery (Form W). Grade 9, 10 and 11 students took the English, Numerical Competence and Reading subtests. Grade 12 students took English, Reading and Mathematics (Parts A and B). The results of these tests are summarized below.

TABLE III: STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS FOR STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL, JUNE 1972

Grade and Test	Possible Score	Range of Scores	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Percentile* of the Mean	Stanine of the Mean
Grade 8, N=78						
Gates-MacGinitie						
Speed & Accuracy	36	7-30	16.8	4.20	78	7
Vocabulary	50	14-47	32.3	5.64	83	8
Comprehension	52	26-52	46.2	5.53	84	8
Beattie Mathematics	60	5-51	22.1	9.04	7	2
Grade 9, N=72						
Stanford Achievement Test						
English	85	27-73	55.2	11.75	50	5
Numerical Competence	45	7-45	30.9	9.60	62	6
Reading	65	13-55	36.0	11.31	52	5
Grade 10, N=30						
English	85	35-74	60.2	8.59	52	5
Numerical Competence	45	27-45	36.8	5.74	77	6
Reading	65	23-57	43.7	8.85	62	6
Grade 11, N=55						
English	85	39-75	64.2	7.07	48	5
Numerical Competence	45	18-45	36.5	7.35	60	6
Reading	65	28-64	45.9	8.86	60	6
Grade 12, N=44						
English	85	50-83	69.5	9.0	58	5
Mathematics, Part A	40	25-40	37.0	3.67	88	7
Mathematics, Total	74	36-73	60.0	9.31	94	8
Reading	65	40-62	51.8	6.56	68	6

*The percentile norms used were those provided by the publisher of each test with the exception of the Beattie Test of Mathematical Fundamentals. For it, the norms were developed in Vancouver schools in March 1960 (N=3,863). The norms used for the Stanford Achievement Test were for college preparatory students.

In all instances but one, the students of University Hill performed at average or above average levels. In the case of the Beattie Test of Mathematical Fundamentals, it is felt now that this particular test was inappropriate for these students since it was primarily a speed test rather than a test of their understanding of mathematical concepts. (A similar conclusion was reached when the test was used at another Vancouver school this year.) The results do not correspond at all with the other test results for the Grade 8 students or the mathematics test results for the other students.

Interpretation

1. The Grade 11 students did not maintain the pattern of steady increases in percentile scores followed by the other grades.
2. Of the three areas tested, mathematics appeared to be the strongest for these students and English, the weakest, but still average.
3. Comparison of the University Hill students with other college-bound students indicated that their progress was indeed satisfactory.

Departmental Exam Results

The following table summarizes the performance of University Hill students who wrote Departmental exams in June, 1971 and June, 1972.

DEPARTMENTAL EXAM RESULTS
June 1971 - June 1972

Number of Students		1971		1972	
Number writing for scholarship		15 (32.6%)*		20 (43.4%)*	
Number obtaining Class 1 scholarships		10 (66.6%)**		12 (60.0%)**	
Number obtaining Class 2 scholarships		3 (20.0%)**		5 (25.0%)**	
Number not qualifying		2 (13.3%)**		3 (15.0%)**	
Number writing regular Departmental exams		11 (23.9%)*		6 (13.0%)*	
		Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
Pass-Fail results in:	Mathematics	4	1	3	2
	Physics	-	-	1	-
	Chemistry	-	-	1	-
	Biology	3	2	2	-
	French	2	-	1	-
	Geography	1	-	-	-
	History	1	1	-	-

* % of Grade 12 students
** % of students writing

Interpretation

Just over 2/5 of the Grade 12 students wrote for scholarship in 1972. This represents a slight increase over the number who wrote in 1971. The results indicate that the performance of students writing for scholarship in 1971 and 1972 was comparable. In 1971 the top five students ranked 9, 22, 24, 25 and 27 in the province, while in 1972 the top five students ranked 10, 11, 13, 21 and 37.

In 1972 six students wrote ten regular departmental exams. The results revealed that student performance on these exams in 1972 was similar to the performance of students in 1971.

Conclusions

Since the primary purpose of gathering the data about University Hill was for the staff to use in making decisions and changes, they would be best qualified to assess its value. The changes that were made throughout the year indicated that the information given to the staff supported ideas they had and pointed out areas to them for further consideration.

From all of the data that was available, it was evident that the staff at University Hill has been working extremely hard to create and improve the school's program. They were all well qualified, dedicated to their ideas and yet willing to work as a unit. They were successful in creating a program which could and did function in a relaxed atmosphere. They were flexible, willing to try new ideas, and able to recognize and correct mistakes.

Most of the students were benefiting from the program. While some students had difficulty in organizing their own time or had not recognized that they were responsible for their own education, most had realized this at some point in the year. Further provisions have been planned for next year for students who did not cope well during the 1971-72 school year. The scholastic achievements of the school were very good. No comparison could be made with previous years due to lack of information, but the school in general was above average when compared with the publisher's norms.

The parents of students at University Hill exhibited a generally favourable opinion of the program. There were, however, parents who were gravely concerned about the school and many others who expressed reservations of one sort or another. Efforts were made, and are to be expanded next year, to improve the communication with and involvement of the parents.

The overall impression of the writer is that University Hill Secondary School has implemented an exciting, dynamic program. The staff seems well equipped with ideas and ambition to sustain and improve the program and as more students take advantage of the opportunities available to them, the program will be strengthened. The changes and provisions agreed upon for next year are realistic and should help solve some of the problems encountered in this year.

ED 076634

EM 009 939

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF CONTRACTED STUDENT TIME QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING CONTRACTED STUDENT TIME AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

As one phase of the University Hill Secondary School evaluation, an assessment will be made of the concept of "Contracted Student Time". Please be frank in answering. You need not sign your name.

Male 151 (56%) Female 121 (44%)

Grade	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Responses	78	69	35	49	41	272
Official Enrolment	98	81	46	56	49	330
Percentage	79.6	85.2	76.1		83.7	82.4

School attended last year

University Hill Secondary	158	(58%)
Another Vancouver school	80	(29%)
A school outside Vancouver	31	(11%)
No Response	3	(1%)

Students attended school in the following countries last year: the U.S.A., Spain, England, Switzerland, Germany, India, and France.

Contracted Student Time - A Definition

Contracted Student Time is defined as the scheduling of student time in addition to allotted class time (called timetabled time) to enable the student to complete the requirements of a course. Please keep this definition in mind when answering the questions below.

The suggested purposes of this approach are:

(1) To provide a student with the opportunity to take responsibility for his own progress.

(2) To provide a slow worker extra time with teacher assistance.

(3) To give a fast worker extra time for reading and research.

(4) To enable a teacher to assign extra time to a student if and when required.

1. Is the above definition of Contracted Student Time a reasonable interpretation of the concept as you understand it?

   Yes 255 (94%) No 11 (4%) Both 1 (<1%) No Response 5 (2%)

Comments:

The definition is essentially correct, but it is too idealistic. 32
Contracted time doesn't work as it was intended. 12
It lets students work at their own pace. 9
It should be used to complete assignments, do catch-up work, etc. 9

2. Do you feel the purposes of Contracted Student Time as outlined above are being fulfilled at University Hill Secondary School this year?

   Yes 150 (55%) No 94 (35%) Both 16 (6%) No Response 12 (4%)

   Comments:

Too much time is wasted, students don't go. 49
Most students are cooperating. 28
It doesn't work for everyone. 25

3. Does the Contracted Student Time approach serve purposes other than those stated? Yes 154 (57%) No 93 (34%) No Response 25 (9%)

   Comments:

It allows students to use their time as they want. 29
It doesn't even meet the purposes listed above. 19
It is basic study time and time to study ahead. 14
It gives students time to goof off. 13

4. How much time is recommended for each subject in your program? Do you spend more or less time to complete the work?

   Due to the confusion about how the first question should be answered, only the second is reported.

Course	Time Actually Spent		
	More	Same	Less
Humanities	195	19	29
Languages	111	29	83
Science	146	27	58
Mathematics	154	29	34
Home Economics	47	26	7
Industrial Education	40	14	22
Commerce	29	8	18
Art	22	6	6
Music	21	9	2
P. E.	93	46	13

5. Where do you do the majority of your contracted time course work? For example, school library, classrooms, public library, UBC, gym, home, etc.

classrooms	155	Public library	18
at home	141	Study carrels	7
school library	96	Gymnasium	6
U. B. C.	26	No Response	9

6. Do you feel you would benefit from more time spent in teacher-directed classes? Yes 122 (44%) No 120 (44%) Both 22 (8%) No Response 8 (3%)

Comments:

It depends on the subject and the teacher, for some yes and others no. 26

7. Which of the following describes your opinion about the amount of contractual time recommended for each subject in your program?

Course	Should be less	Amount is Satisfactory	Should be More
Humanities	33	175	53
Languages	17	143	73
Science	14	140	105
Mathematics	9	110	86
Home Economics	5	30	45
Industrial Education	8	53	43
Commerce	6	41	20
Art	3	17	29
Music	3	30	19
P. E.	15	131	60

8. How are you working this year as compared to last year? (Check one.)

Working harder	135 (50%)
About the same	76 (28%)
Working less	55 (20%)
No Response	6 (2%)

9. Compared with previous years do you feel your level of achievement -

Will be higher	131 (48%)
Won't change	70 (26%)
Will be lower	53 (20%)
No Response	18 (7%)

10. Which approach to student time scheduling do you prefer? (Check one.)

(a) Minimal class time plus contractual time 215 (79%)

(b) Traditional timetable approach as used in most schools 39 (14%)

A combination	5 (2%)
Neither	4 (2%)
No Response	9 (3%)

11. What do you do in the time not spent in class or on contracted work? (Check as many as apply.)

Study at school	164
Study at home	153
Talk with friends	200
Work (part-time job)	34
Do nothing in particular	89
Other (please specify)	

Other	
Read	38
Sports	20
Eat	18
Music	10
Cards	9
Watch films	8
Sleep	5
Go to UBC	4
Art work	3
Smoke	2
No response	2

12. For what grade or age levels is the Contracted Student Time approach appropriate?

It should commence:	during elementary grades	11 (4%)
	with Grade 8	105 (39%)
	with Grade 9	48 (18%)
	with Grade 10	49 (18%)
	with Grade 11	18 (7%)
	with Grade 12	8 (3%)
It is not appropriate for anyone.		6 (2%)
No Response		27 (10%)

13. What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of the Contracted Student Time approach?

Strengths

It allows students to work independently and at their own pace. 64
It makes the student more responsible for his own decisions. 47
It allows more time to devote to special subjects. 28
It makes it easier to get extra help from the teachers. 19
It provides time to pursue individual interests. 17
It makes the students more self-reliant. 16

Weaknesses

Students don't use contracted student time, they just "skip out" or "goof off". 107
Some students don't have the necessary initiative, so they fall behind. 34
There are no quiet places to study. 11

14. Have your attitudes towards school, teachers or yourself changed since school began in September? Yes 215 (79%) No 28 (10%)

No Response 29 (11%)

Comments:

The teachers are more "human" and accessible. 73
School is not as bad as it was. 36
School is worse than it was. 15

15. Have the changes been in the positive direction or negative direction?
Positive 175 (64%) Negative 33 (12%) Both 14 (5%)

No Response 50 (18%)

Comments:

School is "more enjoyable", "more realistic", "better than last year". 23
Students like to go to school now. 14
Students can work on their own. 10

16. Has the Contracted Student Time approach contributed to your attitude changes? Yes 177 (65%) No 44 (16%) Both 9 (3%)

No Response 42 (15%)

Comments:

Students don't dread school now. 17
Students have time to do what they want. 14
Students are more responsible. 14
Contracted student time was not the cause of the changes. 11

17. Any further comments?

This questionnaire was: "a waste of time", "confusing", "dumb". 16
University Hill is a good school but some changes are still needed. 15
We like the school. 11

ED 076635

APPENDIX B

TM 002 040

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM PARENTS OF STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
AND EVALUATION

BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39 (VANCOUVER)

1595 WEST 10th AVENUE
VANCOUVER 9, B.C.
TELEPHONE 731-1131

TO: PARENTS OF STUDENTS ATTENDING
UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

RE: QUESTIONNAIRE ON CONTRACTED STUDENT TIME

Attached is a questionnaire on the concept of "Contracted Student Time" which is now in effect at University Hill Secondary School. As this is a new approach in scheduling students' time for certain school activities, we would appreciate your assistance in assessing this concept.

Would you be kind enough, therefore, to complete the questionnaire in as much detail as possible and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope by February 7.

This questionnaire is primarily to sample the views of parents concerning this new approach. A companion questionnaire will be administered to all students of University Hill. It is desirable, therefore, that your reply expresses your own views which may or may not coincide with the views of your children on the topics under consideration.

All replies will be confidential. It is not necessary for you to sign your name to the return.

May I take this opportunity of thanking you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Yours truly,

D. A. Moir.

D. A. Moir
Assistant Head
Educational Planning

PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING CONTRACTED STUDENT TIME AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL

As one phase of the University Hill Secondary School evaluation, an assessment will be made of the concept of "Contracted Student Time". Please be frank in answering. You need not sign your name.

How many of your children are presently enrolled at University Hill Secondary School?

	Grade					
	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Responses	50	55	24	31	23	183
Official Enrolment	98	81	46	56	49	330
Percentage	51.0	67.9	52.2	55.4	46.9	55.5

What schools did they attend last year?

89 returns had children at University Hill last year.
59 returns had no children at University Hill last year.

Contracted Student Time - A Definition

Students at University Hill Secondary School are assigned less class time per week than is normally the case in secondary school. To compensate, students are allotted Contracted Time in each subject area. Contracted Student Time is defined as the scheduling of student time in addition to allotted class time (called timetabled time) to enable the student to complete the requirements of a course. Please keep this definition in mind when answering the questions below.

The suggested purposes of this approach are:

(1) To provide a student with the opportunity to take responsibility for his own progress.

(2) To provide a slow worker extra time with teacher assistance.

(3) To give a fast worker extra time for reading and research.

(4) To enable a teacher to assign extra time to a student if and when required.

1. Is the above definition of Contracted Student Time a reasonable interpretation of the concept as you understand it?

   Yes 138 (93%) No 7 (5%) No Response 3 (2%)

   Comments:

   The definition is correct but is not practised this way. 4
   The students are not able to take responsibility for their progress. 4

2. Do you feel the purposes of Contracted Student Time as outlined above are being fulfilled at University Hill Secondary School this year?

   Yes 74 (50%) No 47 (32%) Partly 7 (5%) Both 6 (4%)

   No Response 14 (9%)

   Comments:

   Students are too lazy, shy, or immature to use contracted time as it was intended. 14
   More time is needed to evaluate contracted student time. 8
   Students need more guidance and stimulation than they are getting. 4

3. Does the Contracted Student Time approach serve purposes other than those stated?

   Yes 92 (62%) No 28 (19%) No Response 28 (19%)

   Comments:

   Flexible schedule allows time for particular interests. 29
   Provides more time to avoid work and goof off. 19
   It encourages good work habits, initiative and enthusiasm. 9
   Encourages better student-teacher relationships. 8

4. Were you well informed about the concept of Contracted Student Time when school began in September? Yes 75 (50%) No 72 (49%)
   Both 1 ($<$1%)

   Please give your suggestions that might assist the implementation of this approach in other schools.

   Provide a more practical description of how it works. 34
   Promote a better understanding of the concept of contracted student time. 12
   Advise other schools not to use this approach, the old way is better. 11
   Make sure there are more progress checks. 8

5. Please indicate the times during which your son/daughter usually studies at home and approximate amount of time per day he/she spends on home study.

	Seldom or Never	Amount Varies	Under 60 mins.	Over 60 mins.	Don't Know	No Response
In the evening	19	19	58	46	1	8
During school hours	14	19	29	16	50	21
From 3-6 p. m.	49	10	31	8	8	43

6. How does the amount of time your son/daughter spends studying at home compate with the amount he/she spent last year? (Check one.)

More this year 50
About the same 51
Less this year 54

7. Have you noted changes in your son/daughter's attitudes towards school, towards teachers or towards him/herself since starting a Contracted Time program? Yes 115 No 25 No Response 4

Comments:

The student-teacher relationships have improved. 28
The attitudes towards school and him/herself are more positive. 27
The student is more interested in his work and activities. 25
Student is becoming more responsible. 14
Student misses guidance from his teachers, is disillusioned. 12

8. Which approach to scheduling of student time do you prefer for your children?

(a) Traditional timetabled approach as used in most schools 38 (26%)

(b) Minimal class time plus contractual time 83 (56%)

Combination 15 (10%) Gradual introduction to (b) 3 (2%)

Neither 4 (3%) No Response 5 (3%)

Comments:

Contracted student time provides opportunities for students to demonstrate their maturity, initiative and responsibility. 20

A combination of (a) and (b) would probably be the best. 17

Contracted student time allows more flexibility. 12

Some students need more supervision and guidance than they get from (b). 11

9. For what grade or age levels do you feel the Contracted Student Time approach is appropriate?

It should commence:	during the elementary grades	31 (21%)
	with Grade 8	28 (19%)
	with Grade 9	11 (7%)
	with Grade 10	21 (14%)
	with Grade 11	14 (10%)
	with Grade 12	5 (%)
It is not appropriate for anyone.		12 (8%)
It depends on the student.		16 (11%)
No Response		10 (7%)

10. In your opinion, what are the relative strengths and/or weaknesses of the Contracted Student Time approach?

Strengths

It places more responsibility on the students. 44
It allows each student to progress at his own rate. 32
It allows for individualized programs. 19
It provides a wider variety of courses and programs. 17
It encourages self-reliance and self-discipline. 15
It stimulates initiative and interest. 14

Weaknesses

Some students will goof off, and others won't seek the held they need. 42
It doesn't work for all students, some need more structure. 38
It is easy for students to fall behind. 22
It requires better teachers and staff. 16

11. Have you established rules for your son/daughter concerning his/her use of unscheduled or free time during the school day? Yes 34 (23%) No 104 (70%)

Both 2 (1%) No Response 8 (5%)

Comments:

We leave it to the student to manage his time efficiently. 29
Only very general guidelines have been established. 18
Rules of this type are unenforceable. 17

12. Please give any further comments you have concerning Contracted Student Time.

We are happy with the system, we support the system, etc. 27
Contracted student time demands more of the staff, they seem to be well qualified. 13
Students must be taught how to manage their time and work on their own. 9
Students should be screened, this approach is not suitable for everyone. 9
There should be more progress reports. 7
This is not the most effective educational program, it cannot meet its objectives with the present arrangements. 6

APPENDIX C

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FORM USED AT UNIVERSITY HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL IN SEPTEMBER 1971 AND JUNE 1972

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

The Semantic Differential is a technique designed to measure changes in your attitudes toward the following topics: Learning, School Last Year, Books, Teaching, School Discipline, Attendance, Me, Marks, Reports, Adults, School and Teacher, as a result of your year at University Hill. The purpose of administering this scale is to assist in evaluating this experimental program.

You are requested to make an "X" mark where you believe the topic belongs between each pair of opposing adjectives. It is essential that ONE "X" mark be indicated between EVERY pair of adjectives, even though you may be uncertain where it belongs.

Please PRINT your name on the first page. This will enable the Vancouver School Board Department of Planning and Evaluation to compare your responses in September and May. All responses will be treated confidentially.

Before commencing, print these topics, one on each line provided on the answer sheets:

Learning
School Last Year
Books
Teaching
School Discipline
Attendance
Marks
Reports
Me
Adults
School
Teacher

e.g. ——————→ LEARNING

hot _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ cold

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

sick	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ healthy
pleasing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ displeasing
interesting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ boring
ugly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ beautiful
happy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ sad
good	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ bad
hazy	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ clear
meaningful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ meaningless
relaxed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ tense
likeable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ dislikeable